



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/209,162	12/10/1998	MICHELLE BAKER	BAK-004	9135

7590 05/21/2003
DAVID P GORDON
65 WOODS END ROAD
STAMFORD, CT 06905

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

82

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/209,162

Applicant(s)

BAKER, MICHELLE

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24, 26-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the remarks filed on 3/17/2003.

This action is made Final.

2. Claims 1-24, and 26-27 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 20, and 26-27 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2178

5. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 20-22, and 26-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolf et al, hereinafter Wolf (Pat. # 5,818,447, 10/6/1998, filed on 6/6/1996).

Regarding independent claim 1, Wolf discloses: a plurality of word processing components of a full-featured wordprocessor for creating, editing, and encoding an internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3).

Furthermore, Wolf discloses the displaying, editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document using a wordprocessor (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses the editing of an email document using a full featured word-processor, which as was well known in the art included installable components, such as a spell checker (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses the editing of an email document using a full featured word-processor, spreadsheet, desktop publishing applications, etc (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and c.23,L.59-67).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses the editing of an email document using a full featured word-processor, spreadsheet, desktop publishing applications, etc (Col. 14, lines 56-62), and "...the interfaces and techniques described herein may be applied to incorporate other types of applications....spreadsheet program....." (Col. 23, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses: "...the mail note allows a separate, full-featured word processing program to display and edit the message....." (Col. 14, lines 56-62), and "...allow a spreadsheet program....to display their respective documents in the view port provided by the container mail note....." (Col. 23, lines 64-67).

Claim 9 is directed towards a method for implementing the mail client found in claim 8, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses an email authoring program which allowed a user to retrieve an email message or reply to an author or other users or readers (c.2,L.8-67, and c.5,L.20-67).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses an email authoring program which allowed a user to retrieve an email message or reply to an author or other users or readers (c.2,L.8-67, and c.5,L.20-67)--*at least one of said authoring components includes means for recognizing whether a user is an author or a reader.*

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Wolf discloses: "...the mail note allows a separate, full-featured word processing program to display and edit the message....." (Col. 14, lines 56-62), and "...allow a spreadsheet program....to display their respective documents in the view port provided by the container mail note....." (Col. 23, lines 64-67). Wolf teaches an email authoring program to personalize email documents using an stationary graphics, and spellchecking components among other document-authoring components.

Furthermore, Wolf discloses "...the mail note allows a separate, full-featured word processing program to display and edit the message....." (Col. 14, lines 56-62) , and "...the interfaces and techniques described herein may be applied to incorporate other types of applications....spreadsheet program....." (Col. 23, lines 61-67). --*linking each of said document-authoring components with the document-encoding component.*

Claim 20, 22, and 27 is directed towards a method for implementing the mail client found in claims 1, 11, and (1 and 8) respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding independent claim 26, Wolf discloses *a) a plurality of authoring components a first ...for creating a different kind of email message- b) encoding means for automatically encoding said representations...into an Internet-compatible email message* as outlined in claim 1 above.

Furthermore, Wolf discloses: “the email client determines which mail note should be launched....determined by the selected message” (c. 2,L.8-67, c. 20, L.15-67).-- *c) decoding means for automatically decoding said representations* Wolf teaches above the invocation of the proper email note for reading and viewing the decoded internet-compatible email message.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 12 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses: “...the mail note allows a separate, full-featured word processing program to display and edit the message.....” (Col. 14, lines 56-62) , and “...the interfaces and techniques described herein may be applied to incorporate other types of applications....spreadsheet program.....” (Col. 23, lines 61-67). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *at least one of said authoring components includes means for allowing a user to create a read-only document.* However, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have *created a read-only*

Art Unit: 2178

document as it was well known in the art at the time of the invention, because Wolf et al teach:

“..allow a spreadsheet program....to display their respective documents in the view port provided by the container mail note.....” (Col. 23, lines 64-67).

8. Claims 13-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf, in view of Bradshaw et al, hereinafter Bradshaw (Pat. # 6,065,056, 5/16/00, filed on 8/13/98).

Regarding independent claim 13, Wolf discloses: *a) a plurality of authoring components a firstcreating a representation of a document including other than text --b) encoding means for automatically encoding said representations... --c) decoding means for automatically decoding said representations* – in the rejections of claim 1 above.

Furthermore, Wolf fails to explicitly disclose *at least one of said authoring components includes means for determining whether the user is a student or a teacher*. Bradshaw teaches: “enabling a supervisory adult to monitor incoming and outgoing E-mail” (col.3, lines 30-67, and col.4, lines 16-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Wolf, and the monitoring of a student by a teacher or supervisor through a password protected account as taught by Bradshaw, because Bradshaw teaches above the monitoring, and blocking of offensive email messages by a supervisor—*teacher*.

Claim 14 is directed towards an electronic mail client for implementing the mail client found in claim 2, and is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 13, However, Wolf et al disclose: “the mail note allows a separate, full-featured word processing program to display and edit the message” (Col. 14, lines 56-62), and “the interfaces and techniques described herein may be applied to

Art Unit: 2178

incorporate other types of applications....spreadsheet program” (Col. 23, lines 61-67)-- *said plurality of authoring components include at least one... ofworkbook component, and a graphic component.* It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Wolf, and Bradshaw, because Wolf et al teach above the implementation of full-featured application programs (word processors, spreadsheet, drawing etc.) for display and editing an e-mail message.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Wolf discloses: “the mail note allows a separate, full-featured word processing program to display and edit the message” (Col. 14, lines 56-62), and “the interfaces and techniques described herein may be applied to incorporate other types of applications....spreadsheet program” (Col. 23, lines 61-67)--*said plurality of authoring components include at least one... ofdatabase component, a presentation component.* It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Wolf, and Bradshaw, because Wolf et al teach: “allow a spreadsheet program....to display their respective documents in the view port provided by the container mail note” (Col. 23, lines 64-67).

9. Claims 5-7, and 23-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hong et al (Pat. # 5,710,883, 1/20/1998, filed on 3/10/1995).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose:*said encoding means includes MIME-compatible encoding means.*

However, Hong et al disclose: “...program then converts each new note into a formal HTML

document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used.....” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Wolf and Hong et al, because Hong et al teach: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *said encoding means includes means for creating a MIME-compatible file.....* However, Hong et al disclose: “...program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used.....” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Wolf and Hong et al, because Hong et al teach: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Furthermore, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *each of said authoring component cooperating with said encoding means such that a creation of said MIME file.....is transparent to the user.* However, Hong et al disclose: “...program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used.....” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Wolf and Hong et al *such that a creation of said MIME file.....is transparent to the user,* because Hong et al teach: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 6, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *.....said decoding means includes means for concatenating a multipart MIME message.....* However, Hong et al disclose: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Wolf and Hong et al, because Hong et al teach: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Furthermore, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *each of said authoring component cooperating with said decoding means such that a concatenation of said multipart MIME message ... is transparent to the user.* However, Hong et al disclose: “...program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used.....” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Wolf and Hong et al *means such that a concatenation of said multipart MIME message ... is transparent to the user*, because Hong et al teach: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Claims 23-24 are directed towards a method for implementing the mail client found in claims 6-7 respectively, and are similarly rejected.

10. Claims 17-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf, in view of Bradshaw, and further in view of Hong et al.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *said encoding means includes MIME-compatible encoding means*. However, Hong et al disclose: “program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used.....” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Wolf, Bradshaw, and Hong et al, because Hong et al teach: “.....HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message.....” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *said encoding means includes means for creating a MIME-compatible file.....* However, Hong et al disclose: “program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Wolf, Bradshaw, and Hong et al, because Hong et al teach: “HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Furthermore, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *each of said authoring component cooperating with said encoding means such that a creation of said MIME file.....is transparent to the user*. However, Hong et al disclose: “program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is

Art Unit: 2178

used” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Fleming, Bradshaw, and Hong et al *such that a creation of said MIME file.....is transparent to the user*, because Hong et al teach: “HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *said decoding means includes means for concatenating a multipart MIME message*. However, Hong et al disclose: “HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message” (Col. 5, lines 5-9). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Wolf, Bradshaw, and Hong et al, because Hong et al teach: “HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Furthermore, Wolf discloses the editing or decoding of the internet-compatible email document (c.2, L.8-67, c.9, L.1-c.10,L.67, and fig.3). Wolf fails to explicitly disclose: *each of said authoring component cooperating with said decoding means such that a concatenation of said multipart MIME message ... is transparent to the user*. However, Hong et al disclose: “...program then converts each new note into a formal HTML document.....which encodes.....MIME.....scheme is used.....” (Col. 5, lines 2-11). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Wolf, Bradshaw, and Hong et al *means such that a concatenation of said multipart MIME message ... is transparent to the user*, because Hong et al teach: “HTML documents.....are then concatenated into a single e-mail message” (Col. 5, lines 5-9).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant submits that the rejection failed to address every limitation of claim 1, specifically authoring components for creating other than text portion of the document (p.2,L.10-24). The Examiner disagrees, because as was explained in the rejection mailed on 11/8/2002 (p.4,L.8-12), Wolf teaches an invention which employs a container object, and a server object, such as a full featured word processor having authoring components for creating, editing, and encoding internet-compatible message (c.2,L.8-67, c.9,L.1-c.10,L.67, fig.3). It was well known in the art at the time of the invention, that full-featured word processors, such as the one being utilized by Wolf, had components for authoring increasingly complex documents as witnessed by Wolf (c.1,L.27-34). These components would enable a user to create or drawn objects, color or highlight text with a highlighting component, borders, shading, tables, and special bullets—other than text portions of a document.

Moreover, the Applicant submits that the creation of other than text portion of the document, was not addressed by the Examiner until the rejection of claim 3 (p.3,L.1-5). The Examiner disagrees, because as was explained in the rejection of claim 1, Wolf teaches an invention which employs components of a full featured word processor for creating, editing, and encoding internet-compatible message (p.4,L.8-12). The components would enable a user to create or drawn objects, color or highlight text with a highlighting component, borders, shading, tables, and special bullets—other than text portions of a document.

Moreover, the Applicant indicates that the teaching of spreadsheet, and desktop publishing is not teaching the authoring email component (p.3,L.6-27). The Examiner disagrees, because Wolf teaches spreadsheet, and desktop software have components for creating, and editing non-textual email document portions, such as spreadsheets, compound documents for publishing purposes. Wolf's invention consists of using full-featured wordprocessors, spreadsheet, desktop publishing components, instead of using the components of an email program for authoring/editing email documents (c.2,L.8,L.8-41, c.1,L.22-34, c.23,L.59-67, and fig.3).

Further, the Applicant indicates that Wolf teaches away from the authoring non-text objects, and that there is no email authoring components found in its teachings (p.4,L.14-19). The Examiner disagrees, because Wolf teaches the incorporation of full-featured wordprocessors, spreadsheet, desktop publishing functionality into an email client program for authoring/editing email non-textual portions of email documents, such as highlighting, creating table, borders, shading, etc., (c.2,L.8,L.24-42, c.1,L.22-34, c.23,L.59-67, and fig.3).

Further, the Applicant indicates that Wolf is mainly concerned with the linking of a word processor and an email program for displaying rich text documents, and that the wordprocessor is a separate program not part of the email client (p.4,L.20-26). The Examiner disagrees, because Wolf teaches more than just displaying an email message, and linking an email client and wordprocessor. Wolf teaches the incorporation of full-featured wordprocessors, spreadsheet, desktop publishing functionality/formatting capabilities into an email client program for authoring/editing email documents. The components of the full-featured programs are integrated

Art Unit: 2178

along with the email components to create a single program for displaying and creating/editing email documents (c.2,L.8,L.24-42, c.1,L.22-34, c.23,L.59-67, and fig.3).

Claims 20-22 recite limitations similar to those found in claim 1. Therefore the explanations concerning claim 1 above similarly apply.

Regarding claim 26, the Applicant indicates that Wolf teaches different reading programs associated with an email program, and these are not components of the email programs (p.5,L.10-18). The Examiner disagrees, because Wolf teaches an email program merged with full-featured program module components (c.2,L.8,L.24-42, c.1,L.22-34, c.23,L.59-67, and fig.3). The email client is availing itself of the formatting capabilities of program components, such as a full-featured word processor, not just invoking a separate program to edit objects related to that program. Wordprocessing components are introduced into the email interface for use in tandem with the email program—thereby enabling the email client user to edit the email document from the email program. The components are included in, and are a part of the email client.

Regarding claim 27, the Applicant indicates that Wolf teaches only one authoring component (p.5,L.22-p.6,L.1). The Examiner disagrees, because as has been stated above, Wolf teaches an email program merged with full-featured program module components—components for drawing objects, highlight, create bullets, borders, tables, etc (c.2,L.8,L.24-42, c.1,L.22-34, c.23,L.59-67, and fig.3).

Claims 12-16 recite limitations similar to those found in claim 1. Therefore the explanations concerning claim 1 above similarly apply.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 13, the Applicant indicates that Wolf doesn't teach email authoring component which distinguishes between a teacher and a student (p.6,L.16-23). The Examiner disagrees, because Bradshaw teaches a component for the monitoring of email by a supervisory adult, such as a teacher, of students email through the use of a password (c.3,L.30-67, c.14,L.16-67, c.7,L.48-67). Therefore, the system's components can be accessed by typing a password, which is associated with a user --supervisor/teacher, or student—If the password is that of a teacher, then the teacher is allow to access functionality not available to a student's password.

The explanations made above similarly apply to claims 14-16.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, **except formal After Final communications**)

Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

CBP

5/15/03


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER